

REMARKS

Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21 are pending in the above-identified application. Claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15 and 21 were rejected. With this Amendment, claims 22-27 are added and claim 8 is amended to correct a minor typographical error. Accordingly, claims 1, 7, 8, 14, 15, and 21-27 are at issue in the above-identified application.

I. 35 U.S.C. §102 Anticipation Rejection of Claims

Currently pending claims 1, 8, and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C §102(b) as being anticipated by *Person et al.* (“Special Edition Using Microsoft(R) Word 97,” 1997, hereinafter “*Person*”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and request reconsideration.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found either expressly or inherently, in a single prior art reference.” MPEP §2131.

While *Person* may disclose style templates, *Person* fails to teach that these style templates are stored in a first record and the text information is stored in one or more second records, with information linking the text to the styles. These features are advantageous in storing style attributes for text documents in a compact manner to facilitate their use and manipulation on personal electronic devices. *Person* merely provides a broad lesson that Microsoft Word 97(R) may be used to apply style templates, saving time over direct formatting. *See Person*, p. 16. *Person* contains no discussion of how the style templates and text are stored, and certainly does not disclose the records and linking information in accordance with the present claims. *See Person*, p. 16-18. In fact, *Person* does even mention a storing step. Accordingly, *Person* neither expressly nor inherently teaches these elements, and therefore does

not anticipate claim 1. Claims 8 and 15 are not anticipated by *Person* for at least the same reasons that claim 1 is not anticipated by *Person*.

Claims 22-27 are added to recite additional features in accordance with the present invention. Claims 22, 24, and 26 are directed to extracting the set of styles from the word processing document. Claims 23, 25, and 27 are directed to storing the first record and one or more second records in a records-based storage system of a personal electronic device. *Person* also fails to teach or even suggest these additional features.

Claims 1 and 15 are not amended, and claim 8 is amended only to correct a minor typographical error. Thus, claims 1, 8, and 15 do not contain amendments that would require newly cited art. A second or any subsequent action on the merits in any application should not be made final if it includes a rejection, on newly cited art, of any claim not amended to require newly cited art, in spite of the fact that other claims may have been amended to require newly cited art. *See* MPEP § 706.07(a). Accordingly, if claims 1, 8, and 15 are rejected based on newly cited art in the next Official Action, that rejection should not be made final despite the addition of claims 22-27.

III. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicants submit that all claims are allowable over the cited prior art, and respectfully requests early and favorable notification to that effect.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: January 4, 2006

By: 

A. Wesley Ferrebee
Reg. No. 51,312

Customer Number: 58328 (formerly 26263)
SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP
P.O. Box 061080
Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower
Chicago, IL 60606-1080
Phone: (202) 408-6832
Fax: (312) 876-7457